- 1 {York Stenographic Services, Inc.}
- 2 RPTS BURDETTE
- 3 HIF162.160
- 4 MEDIA OWNERSHIP IN THE 21ST CENTURY
- 5 WEDNESDAY, JUNE 11, 2014
- 6 House of Representatives,
- 7 Subcommittee on Communications and Technology
- 8 Committee on Energy and Commerce
- 9 Washington, D.C.

- The Subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10:35 a.m.,
- 11 in Room 2123 of the Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Greg
- 12 Walden [Chairman of the Subcommittee] presiding.
- 13 Members present: Representatives Walden, Latta,
- 14 Shimkus, Terry, Blackburn, Lance, Guthrie, Kinzinger, Long,
- 15 Barton, Eshoo, Braley, Lujan, Rush, Butterfield, and Waxman
- 16 (ex officio).

```
Staff present: Ray Baum, Senior Policy Advisor/Director
17
18
    of Coalitions; Sean Bonyun, Communications Director; Matt
19
    Bravo, Professional Staff Member; Andy Duberstein, Deputy
20
    Press Secretary; Gene Fullano, Detailee, Telecom; Kelsey
    Guyselman, Counsel, Telecom; Grace Koh, Counsel, Telecom;
21
22
    David Redl, Counsel, Telecom; Charlotte Savercool,
23
    Legislative Coordinator; Tom Wilbur, Digital Media Advisor;
24
    Shawn Chang, Democratic Chief Counsel for Communications and
25
    Technology Subcommittee; Margaret McCarthy, Democratic
26
    Professional Staff Member; and Ryan Skukowski, Democratic
    Policy Analyst.
27
```

```
28
         Mr. {Walden.} If our friends and visitors could come on
29
    in and get a seat, we will close those back doors, just to
30
    hold--
31
         {Voice.} Front doors.
32
         Mr. {Walden.} Yeah, or the front doors, I guess. I
33
    want to call to order the Subcommittee on Communications and
34
    Technology, and welcome you all for our Media Ownership in
    the 21st Century hearing, and thank our witnesses for taking
35
    time to be here. We really appreciate your counsel and your
36
37
    testimony.
38
         I will open with my opening statement, and then we will
39
    move to Ms. Eshoo for hers.
40
         What do the founding of Microsoft, the first episode of
41
    Saturday Night Live, and the establishment of the
    broadcast/newspaper cross-ownership ban have in common?
42
43
    Well, they are all about ready to turn 40, because they all
44
    took place in 1975. But where Microsoft has innovated and
45
    moved past a world where MS-DOS was the state-of-the-art, and
46
    Saturday Night Live continues to reinvent itself as an
47
    essential piece of Americana, the media ownership rules
```

48 persist as though the Internet simply did not exist. Our 49 laws need to reflect the reality of the world we live in 50 today, not the world of the Ford Administration. It is my 51 sincere hope that today's discussion can spur us to 52 rationalize the rules and regulations for a media industry 53 that serves consumers in this century and not in the last. 54 The Ford Administration, as noted there, with one chairman of 55 the subcommittee posed with Mr. Ford, just to put in context 56 how things have changed, beyond just my hairline. 57 In today's media environment, traditional media like 58 Bend--thank you for taking that down now. Traditional media, 59 like Bend, Oregon's, KTVZ-TV and the town's Bulletin newspaper compete with Twitter, The Drudge Report, The 60 61 Huffington Post, Fox News, MSNBC, CNN, the Wall Street Journal, and the New York Times. You can get it all right 62 63 there. We live in an era of a 24-hour news cycle and ondemand national media, but our laws assume a world where 64 65 local newspapers and broadcast stations are so influential 66 that economies of scale are dangerous to the public interest. While proponents of the status quo express their love of 67 68 localism and the laws intended to guarantee it, I fear that

69 laws intended to ensconce our love of local media are, in 70 fact, loving it to death. 71 Promoting localism is a goal that we all share; but 72 localism is not cheap. Producing the kind of high-quality 73 content that has been the hallmark of American broadcasting 74 is an expensive labor of love for local broadcasters and 75 newspapers, and as Americans' habits have changed, so too 76 should the way we look at local media. We live in a 77 competitive landscape where increasingly we cherry-pick 78 articles; we scroll through feeds and aggregators; and we 79 have multiple national news programming options, and we DVR 80 almost everything to time-shift the programming that we love. It is a different world, so why don't our media laws reflect 81 82 these changes? 83 The fact is, the FCC has tried to change these rules as 84 early as its 2002 review of media ownership rules, when it 85 recognized the competitive force of the Internet. The 86 Commission would have done away with the ban on cross-87 ownership of a daily newspaper and a broadcast station, and 88 expanded the caps on local ownership of television and radio 89 stations, but the courts overturned the FCC's proposed rule,

90 not because it believed that repeal was unreasonable. In fact, the court determined that, and I quote, ``reasoned 91 92 analysis supports the Commission's determination that the 93 blanket ban on newspaper/broadcast cross-ownership was no 94 longer in the public interest.'' The Third Circuit threw out 95 the proposed new rules because it thought the Commission 96 relied too heavily on the Internet as a significant 97 competitive factor. I wonder what the court would say today 98 if the same proposal were before it, now that newspapers' 99 annual revenues are down more than half since 2003. Would 100 the same bench consider the Internet a significant 101 competitive factor now that the average online video ad often 102 out-prices national TV day-parts? 103 Sadly, following two court losses, it seems that for a 104 while the FCC simply gave up on trying to save this industry from antiquated regulation. The Commission failed to 105 106 complete the 2010 quadrennial review; its statutorily-107 mandated review of media ownership rules, and instead has 108 doubled down by making changes that make it more difficult 109 for local media to compete. The Commission's recent 110 decisions to unwind many joint sales agreements and to look

111 askance at shared service arrangements ignore the realities 112 of the broadcast business and are affirmatively harmful to 113 the localism they purport to protect. 114 I am happy to see that the Commission intends to return 115 to reasoned rulemaking consistent with its statutory mandate. 116 Chairman Wheeler has announced his intention to comply with 117 the law and complete the 2014 quadrennial review in a timely 118 manner. And while the law is very specific in the 119 Commission's mandate to deregulate media ownership where 120 warranted, given the recent set of FCC decisions, I am, to 121 quote the man for whom this room is named, ``comforted very little.'' Without relief, I fear that local broadcast and 122 123 newspaper companies will continue to struggle against 124 unregulated competitors whose businesses are not hamstrung by 125 decades-old regulatory assumptions. Newspaper classified advertising peaked in 2000 at \$19.6 billion. In 2012, 126 127 classified advertising brings in \$4.6 billion. That is a 77 128 percent drop in revenues just from classified advertising, 129 primarily due to shifts in classifieds to such Internet 130 entities as Craigslist. Unsurprisingly, hundreds of 131 newspapers have shuttered operations or migrated to digital-

132 only since '07, and the U.S. has lost, lost 62 daily 133 newspapers since 2004. 134 We are all committed to promoting a local media industry 135 that is healthy; to fostering competition, localism, and diversity of voices, and to ensuring that local media 136 137 continues to serve the needs of their communities, but 138 pretending that laws designed for an era before smartphones 139 and the Internet will get the job done is an effective death 140 sentence for many local media outlets. 141 I would like to thank our witnesses again for joining us 142 today to offer their opinions on these matters. We 143 appreciate your taking the time, and we look forward to your 144 testimony. 145 [The prepared statement of Mr. Walden follows:] ****** COMMITTEE INSERT ******** 146

147 Mr. {Walden.} And with that, I would recognize the 148 ranking member of the subcommittee, the gentlelady from 149 California, Ms. Eshoo, for her opening statement. Ms. {Eshoo.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And welcome to 150 151 the witnesses, and thank you for being willing to testify 152 today at this important hearing that the chairman has called. 153 I believe that one of the most important manifestations 154 of a vibrant democracy is that there are many voices speaking 155 to the many, and so whatever I say in my opening statement really fits in with that principle because I think it is such 156 157 an essential one, and I think it is one that should guide us 158 in everything that we do relative to these undertakings in the examination of media ownership in this, the 21st century. 159 160 In an era when corporate media outlets have become 161 increasingly concentrated in the hands of a few 162 conglomerates, our goal, and the chairman mentioned this, 163 should be to promote localism, advance competition, and 164 encourage diversity, not to roll back what few protections we have in these key areas. I would like to put forward some 165 facts that I find troubling. Despite a national broadcast 166

167 television ownership cap, 10 station groups now own over 650 stations, or nearly 1/2 of all commercial full-powered 168 169 broadcast stations in the United States. The source of that 170 is free press. Ten companies control 55 percent of all local 171 TV advertising revenues. Twenty-five percent of the Nation's 172 952 local news stations do not produce their newscast 173 themselves. You combine these statistics with the fact that 174 20 out of the top 25 news Wet sites rely heavily or even 175 exclusively on news gathered from traditional media sources, 176 such as a daily newspaper, broadcast network or a cable news network, and you have a picture of what I think is an 177 178 unhealthy media landscape. 179 So as the FCC takes steps to close existing loopholes in 180 its rules, I am pleased that the Agency is moving forward 181 with its review of our Nation's broadcast ownership rules. 182 The completion of the long overdue 2010 quadrennial review 183 and the 2014 review will ensure the FCC can fully assess the 184 impact of further consolidation on ownership, diversity and 185 localism in our Nation's media system. And while some have criticized the FCC for cracking down on sidecar deals before 186 concluding its 2010 review, I think that the Agency has an 187

188 obligation to enforce the existing rules on the books, 189 regardless of the outcome of its review. 190 Congress has long entrusted the FCC with upholding the 191 core values of competition, localism and diversity of media, 192 and while the media landscape may change, and we welcome 193 those changes, the role that the these values play in 194 advancing public disclosure and strengthening our democracy, 195 I think, should remain intact. 196 So again, thank you to our witnesses, and I would like 197 to not only submit for the record a letter written by Common Cause, Mr. Chairman, supporting FCC action on JSA's, and I 198 199 would like to yield the remainder of my time to Mr. 200 Butterfield. 201 [The prepared statement of Ms. Eshoo follows:] ****** COMMITTEE INSERT ******** 202

206 Ms. {Eshoo.} Thank you. 207 Mr. {Butterfield.} I thank the ranking member for yielding this morning, and certainly thank you for your 208 passion on diversity. It is very much appreciated. 209 210 Mr. Chairman, I offer the following statement. African-211 Americans, Hispanic-Americans and Asian-Americans own a 212 combined 3 percent of all full-powered, commercially owned 213 and operated TV stations here in the United States, and the 214 number for radio are not much better. Access to capital, consolidation and outdated ownership rules further stifle 215 216 minority ownership. Increasing diversity ownership is 217 important. It ensures the content--that content will be delivered in formats that mirror the cultural experiences of 218 219 our citizens, and generates economic opportunities for the 220 Nation, particularly as these companies create and maintain 221 jobs. The future of our media will also be dependent upon 222 our ability to factor-in the impact of emerging and evolving 223 digital technologies on traditional media models. The FCC regularly says that diversity is one of its objectives, but 224 the 2014 quadrennial NPRM doesn't reflect that commitment. 225

226 Some proposals, including legislative ones pending for 20 227 years, were reduced to footnotes. Many of those proposals 228 were supported by the FCC's own Diversity Advisory Committee. 229 I am hopeful, Mr. Chairman, the FCC's long-awaited further notice of proposed rulemaking for 2014, if not done 230 231 correctly, will seek to gather data that will help us to 232 address the disparities that exist in minority media 233 ownership. We must increase meaningful media ownership 234 opportunities for people of color. That is the point I am 235 trying to make. 236 Thank you very much. I yield back to you--to the 237 ranking member. 238 [The prepared statement of Mr. Butterfield follows:] 239 ******* COMMITTEE INSERT *********

14

```
1
240
         Ms. {Eshoo.} And I yield back, Mr. Chairman. Thank
241
    you.
242
         Mr. {Butterfield.} Mr. Chairman, I failed to do one
    thing. If I momentarily could ask--
243
         Mr. {Walden.} Of course.
244
245
         Mr. {Butterfield.} --unanimous consent to include in
246
    the hearing into the record a letter dated June 10, 2014,
247
    addressed to you and to the ranking member.
248
         Mr. {Walden.} I believe so, yes. Without objection.
249
         [The information follows:]
    ******* COMMITTEE INSERT ********
250
```

251 Mr. {Butterfield.} All right. Thank you. Mr. {Walden.} Are there any members on our side seeking 252 253 an opening statement? Okay. Mr. Waxman, I would turn to 254 you. 255 Mr. {Waxman.} Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. 256 Americans have more choices today than ever before about 257 where to get news, information, entertainment. Broadband and 258 mobile platforms are altering how content is produced and 259 consumed, but these incredible new innovations do not alter key policy goals, promoting localism, diversity and 260 261 competition in the media. These core values represent a 262 commitment that stretches all the way back to the founding of 263 our country. They have animated the FCC's policies for 264 nearly a century. A commitment to localism means timely 265 delivery of news and information relevant to our daily lives, 266 such as emergency alerts in a time of crisis. Competition 267 means original, in-depth reporting that not only informs and 268 educates the public, but helps distinguishes the quality of journalism. Striving for diversity helps the delivery of a 269 270 wealth of perspectives that more closely reflect the diverse

271 makeup and experiences of our community. 272 The FCC's longstanding media cross-ownership rules are tools for preserving these values. Despite the wonder and 273 274 power of the Internet, broadcasters and newspapers continue to be the dominant sources for local news and information 275 276 across old and new medium. That makes these rules relevant 277 even today. 278 Under both Democrats and Republicans, the FCC has tried 279 to revise the media ownership rules, but the Agency has 280 little success in navigating the legal, political and resources challenges in meeting the congressional directive 281 to review these rules every 4 years. Chairman Wheeler has 282 283 appropriately set a deadline to complete the long-overdue 2010 guadrennial review, and the currently-pending 2014 284 285 quadrennial review. As the Agency works to complete these 286 reviews, I believe it is time for Congress to examine whether 287 this statutory mandate is still helpful or necessary. 288 One constructive step the FCC has recently taken is 289 closing a loophole created by the proliferation of joint 290 sales agreements between broadcasters. The FCC struck the right balance in adopting rule changes to end JSA's 291

292 manufactured solely to evade the media ownership rules, while 293 allowing truly beneficial ones to continue through waivers. 294 The committee worked on a bipartisan basis in the recently 295 reported Satellite Reauthorization Bill to provide incentives 296 for broadcasters to file timely requests for waivers, and the 297 FCC to expeditiously act on them. 298 A key consideration for the FCC should be helping ensure 299 the health of the newspaper sector, which has been challenged 300 by the growth of online news. A broadcast company that wants 301 to invest in a newspaper could be a boon to a struggling 302 newspaper, but one that wants to raid its assets could hasten 303 its demise. 304 These are not just theoretical questions. Late last year, the Tribune Corporation, the owner of the Los Angeles 305 306 Times, other newspapers and broadcast stations across the 307 country, announced that they would be spinning off its 308 newspaper holdings, including the LA Times. The original 309 terms would have forced the LA Times to rent its own building 310 from the Tribune Company, and to borrow over \$300 million to 311 pay a cash dividend to the Tribune Corporation. I raised 312 questions and consulted with independent media experts who

313 advised that the terms could cripple the LA Times. To its credit, the Tribune Corporation has recently reduced the size 314 315 of the cash payment it will demand from the newspaper, LA and 316 other newspapers. I hope it will take further steps to 317 ensure the viability of the Times before the deal is 318 complete. 319 Finally, our discussion today would be incomplete 320 without an examination of the miserable state of media 321 ownership diversity. Women and minorities represent a tiny 322 fraction of the owners and decision-makers in the media companies that shape our national discourse. The FCC has had 323 324 great difficulty crafting policies that could improve 325 ownership diversity and survive legal challenge. I hope 326 today's witnesses can bring some fresh thinking and new ideas 327 to help advance this issue, which is so critical for a healthy democracy. 328 329 I thank all the witnesses for being here today. I must 330 apologize in advance that I have to be present at another 331 subcommittee, and won't be here for all of your testimony. I will try to get back for questions, but I appreciate your 332 333 participation and I look forward to reviewing what you have

334	to say, both orally and your written submissions.
335	Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yield back my time.
336	[The prepared statement of Mr. Waxman follows:]
337	********* COMMITTEE INSERT *********

Mr. {Walden.} Thank you, Mr. Waxman. And I will turn 338 now to the vice chair of the subcommittee, Mr. Latta, for 339 opening comments. 340 Mr. {Latta.} Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank 341 342 you very much for holding today's hearing, and I appreciate 343 all the witnesses being with us today. 344 The media landscape, much like many other sectors in the 345 communications and technology industry, has evolved considerably over the last 20 years. With the introduction 346 of the Internet and digital technology, we have seen 347 348 convergence, increased competition, innovative content 349 delivery services, and in rapidly-shifting preferences and consumer demand, come to define the media market, however, 350 351 many of the laws that govern this space are outdated. As a 352 result, long-time industry participants that are subject to 353 these rules and regulations are placed at a competitive 354 disadvantage to newer market entrants. This has thwarted 355 their ability to flexibly and quickly respond and compete in this dynamic marketplace. Of particular concern is the FCC 356 has been negligent in completing its mandatory review of the 357

```
358
    media market that could help address today's competitive
359
    realities.
360
          As we continue our efforts to examine the Communications
361
    Act, and consider updates to the wall that would better
     reflect the 21st century communications landscape, I look
362
     forward to the hearing and hearing from our witnesses today,
363
364
     and the currently regulatory framework governing media
365
    ownership and the impact that it is having on businesses,
366
    consumers and the economy.
367
          And, Mr. Chairman, if I could, I would yield to the
     gentleman from Illinois.
368
          [The prepared statement of Mr. Latta follows:]
369
     ****** COMMITTEE INSERT ********
370
```

```
371
          Mr. {Shimkus.} I want to thank my colleague. I want to
372
    welcome you all here.
373
          The--there is no reason why the 2010 and 2014 review--
     quadrennial review has not been filed. It is just not
374
375
     complying with the law, and it is a failure of the
376
    bureaucracy and the Federal Government to do its job. Having
377
     said that, one reason why, because this sector is moving so
378
     fast, I mean how do you get a handle on it? Late-breaking
379
     story last night. How did I find out about it? Someone did
    a Twitter feed that one of my staff members picked up and
380
381
     emailed to me. I didn't get it over broadcast, I didn't get
382
     it over cable, I didn't get it over radio, I definitely
     didn't get it out of print media, I got out of this new world
383
384
     age of information flow.
          There is more access to information now than ever
385
386
    before. These media ownership rules stifle the ability for
387
     localism in rural America.
388
          I look forward to this hearing and I thank you all for
389
     coming.
390
          [The prepared statement of Mr. Shimkus follows:]
```

391 ******** COMMITTEE INSERT *********

```
392
         Mr. {Butterfield.} Mr. Chairman, I--
393
          Mr. {Walden.} Gentleman yields back the balance of his
394
     time. All the opening statements are concluded, and we will
     now go to testimony from our witnesses.
395
          And again, we thank you all very much for the work you
396
397
    have put into your testimony.
398
          We will start off with Mr. William T. Lake, who is the
399
    Chief of the Media Bureau of the Federal Communications
400
    Commission. Mr. Lake, we are delighted to have you here
401
    before the subcommittee. Pull that microphone pretty close
     to your mouth or we won't be able to hear your fine words,
402
403
     sir. So thank you, and please -- we look forward to your
404
     testimony.
```

```
^STATEMENTS OF WILLIAM LAKE, CHIEF, MEDIA BUREAU, FEDERAL
405
406
     COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION; JESSICA GONZALEZ, EXECUTIVE VICE
407
     PRESIDENT AND GENERAL COUNSEL, NATIONAL HISPANIC MEDIA
     COALITION; BERNARD LUNZER, PRESIDENT, NEWSPAPER GUILD-CWA;
408
409
     PAUL BOYLE, SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT OF PUBLIC POLICY, NEWSPAPER
410
    ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA; DAVID BANK, MANAGING DIRECTOR, GLOBAL
411
    MEDIA EQUITY RESEARCH, RBC CAPITAL MARKETS; AND JANE MAGO,
412
    EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AND GENERAL COUNSEL, LEGAL AND
413
    REGULATORY AFFAIRS, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS
     414
     ^STATEMENT OF WILLIAM LAKE
         Mr. {Lake.} Thank you. Good morning, Chairman Walden,
415
416
    Ranking Member--
417
          Mr. {Walden.} You really are going to have to pull this
418
     just about like that.
419
          Mr. {Lake.} How is that? Okay?
420
          Mr. {Walden.} That is much better.
421
          Mr. {Lake.} Good morning, Chairman Walden, Ranking
    Member Eshoo, and members of the subcommittee. My name is
422
```

423 Bill Lake, I am the Chief of the Media Bureau at the FCC, and 424 I am very happy to be with you today. 425 I would like to highlight a few points from my written statement about the actions that the Commission and the Media 426 Bureau took in March relating to media ownership. 427 428 First, the quadrennial review. The FCC is very aware of 429 its responsibility to review its media ownership rules every 430 4 years. As you know, in March, the Commission began its 431 most recent review, adopting a further notice that builds on 432 the record of the ongoing 2010 proceeding. The further notice analyzes the evidence to date on each of the rules, 433 434 and discusses the diversity issues remanded to the Commission 435 by the Third Circuit. I recognize that some observers, including members of 436 the subcommittee, are concerned that the Commission has yet 437 438 to complete its 2010 quadrennial review. As Chairman Wheeler 439 noted in March, the Commission's inability to complete that review was not for lack of effort. We began the proceeding 440 441 early in November 2009, compiled an extensive record, and circulated a proposed Order in 2012, which remained before 442 443 the Commission for over a year but failed to receive a

444 majority. The further notice will enable all interested parties to supplement the record with information about the 445 446 2014 marketplace. The chairman has committed to present recommendations to the commissioners by June 30, 2016. 447 448 Second, shared services agreements, or SSA's. As part 449 of the further notice, the Commission sought to improve its 450 understanding of the sharing of services between separatelyowned TV stations. The Commission does not now require SSA's 451 452 to be disclosed, and that makes it hard for us or the public to know what impact these agreements may have on our 453 policies. The further notice invites comment on whether and 454 how best to disclose SSA's. 455 456 Third, TV joint sales agreements or JSA's. The Commission also adopted a report and order on TV JSA's. 457 JSA's are agreements between stations in which one station 458 459 sells advertising time on behalf of the other. Typically, all of it. Unlike SSA's, they are well known to the 460 461 Commission. We have long recognized our duty to identify any 462 interests that give holders a realistic potential to influence a station's programming or operations. We treat 463 464 such interest as attributable, that is, we count the stations

465 as being commonly owned for purposes of our ownership rules. The Commission tentatively concluded in 2004 that it should 466 attribute TV JSA's just as it had done for radio JSA's in 467 2003. The rationale is that someone who controls a station's 468 main source of revenue has a significant potential to 469 470 influence the station's operations. 471 Based on the record, and in light of the growing 472 prevalence of TV JSA's, the Commission decided that it should 473 attribute these agreements with a 2-year transition period 474 for existing JSA's, as we had done for radio. Finally, I can provide a bit of context for the Media 475 476 Bureau's public notice in March, which gave guidance to the 477 industry on how the Bureau will process pending and future TV license transfer applications. In releasing the public 478 479 notice, the Bureau sought to provide greater transparency to 480 the industry about concerns that had come to light in our review of proposed license transfers. Transactions we have 481 482 seen in recent years have involved increasingly complex 483 relationships between stations that our rules do not allow to 484 be jointly owned. In particular, more and more transactions involve combinations of sharing arrangements and financial 485

486 ties, such as options and loan guarantees. We have found that determining the economic effects of a transaction 487 488 requires much more extensive analysis when stations have such complex entanglements, and though we must decide each case on 489 its particular facts, case-by-case decisions by themselves 490 491 may not give broadcasters the predictability they want as 492 they structure deals. 493 The public notice is intended to increase transparency 494 by making sure that broadcasters appreciate that deals 495 involving complex interrelationships require more extensive review, and by highlighting the combinations of relationships 496 497 that we have found most troubling as we evaluate whether one 498 station may have undue influence over another. By arming the parties with this knowledge, we sought to guide them as they 499 500 structure future deals or consider amendments to pending 501 transactions. From what we have seen so far, this increased transparency has been helpful. Far from coming to a halt, 502 503 deal-making in the industry continues. Since mid-March, we 504 have approved the sale of 36 full power stations, representing 12 different deals. 505 506 Again, thank you for the opportunity to be here today,

Mr. {Walden.} Mr. Lake, thank you for your service and for your testimony. We look forward to continuing the discussion.

We will now go to Jessica J. Gonzalez, Executive Vice President and General Counsel, the National Hispanic Media Coalition. Ms. Gonzalez, thank you for being here. Please go ahead.

517 ^STATEMENT OF JESSICA GONZALEZ Ms. {Gonzalez.} Thank you, Chairman Walden, Ranking 518 519 Member Eshoo, and members of the subcommittee. 520 I represent the National Hispanic Media Coalition, a 521 media advocacy and civil rights organization working towards 522 a media that is fair, inclusive and accessible to all people. 523 What happens in an overly-consolidated media system that fails to reflect American multiculturalism? Here is an 524 525 example from the radio industry, which is already plagued by 526 major consolidation. On Clear Channel radio stations across 527 the country, listeners are fed a steady diet of racism and 528 stereotyping. According to some Clear Channel pundits, 529 Latinos and African-Americans are dangerous, Asians are cheaters, women are sluts, immigrants are animals. At a time 530 531 when this country should be developing its proud, 532 multicultural identity, instead, this dehumanization of women 533 and people of color is normalized over the public airwaves. We as parents of young children of color and young girls 534 have to figure out how to explain these slurs to our 535

536 children, who don't see color, but yet are told at a young age that they are different or they are feared, or they are 537 538 less than. The harms of this rhetoric are deep and well 539 documented. Clear Channel has 850-plus stations in over 150 cities across the country. It exploits the lack of strong 540 541 radio ownership limits to insulate its stations from free 542 market accountability mechanisms, such as losing audience share or revenue. It is totally out of touch with the 543 544 communities it serves. 545 Media ownership limits are vital to the health of our 546 democracy. These content and race-neutral rules promote 547 ownership diversity, viewpoint diversity, localism and 548 completion. Broadcasters and newspapers play a critically 549 important role in informing Americans, and influencing 550 attitudes towards people of color and women. Broadcast TV 551 and radio reach over 98 percent of us, and reliance on over-552 the-air TV is prevalent in poor, rural and non-English-553 speaking communities. 554 Internet sources are far from achieving parody with broadcasters when it comes to disseminating information, 555 particularly local news. First of all, 1 in 3 Americans does 556

557 not have home broadband access. Rural communities, Latinos, African-Americans, seniors, the poor, people with 558 559 disabilities, and non-English-speakers are far less likely to 560 be connected to the Internet. And traditional media sources 561 like broadcasting and newspapers are still responsible for 562 the vast majority of online local news and information. The 563 courts, Congress and the FCC have long recognized a nexus 564 between minority ownership and broadcasting diversity, yet 565 people of color, who make up more than 36 percent of the U.S. population, own less than 3 percent of TV stations. Women 566 own less than 7 percent. Media consolidation and joint sales 567 568 agreements that allow big media companies to circumvent the 569 ownership rules are bad for diversity. 570 Immediately after the 1996 Act, relaxed ownership limits 571 and the minority tax certificate was abandoned, women and 572 people of color were pushed from the market as conglomerates 573 grew. According to a 1997 NTIA report, relaxed ownership 574 limits created a significant competitive advantage for group 575 owners who are more likely to be non-diverse and have greater financial resources. That media concentration drove up 576 577 station prices.

578 The FCC's recent JSA ruling, on the other hand, creates opportunities for diverse owners and small businesses to 579 580 enter the market. 581 An agency envisions a country in which broadcasters reflect American multiculturalism and serve the information 582 583 needs of all communities. Promoting diversity and localism 584 with strong media ownership rules within the FCC's existing 585 regulatory framework, and using your law-making power to 586 reinstate the minority tax certificate, are important steps 587 towards achieving that vision. 588 Thank you and I look forward to questions. 589 [The prepared statement of Ms. Gonzalez follows:] ********** INSERT 2 ********* 590

```
Mr. {Walden.} Ms. Gonzalez, thank you for your powerful testimony. We appreciate your comments.

We will now turn to Mr. Bernard Lunzer, President of the Newspaper Guild-CWA. Mr. Lunzer, thank you for being here.

We look forward to your testimony as well, sir.
```

```
596
     ^STATEMENT OF BERNARD LUNZER
597
          Mr. {Lunzer.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member
     and the committee for allowing me to testify.
598
599
          News Guild-CWA represents workers in broadcast, print
600
     and digital. Our sister sector, NABET-CWA, represents
     workers throughout broadcast. Along with our employer rep,
601
602
     some of them that are here, we seek solutions to the current
603
     challenges in media.
604
          The Internet will continue its disruption of media,
605
     while also offering room for innovation and new revenue.
     Right now, there are no simple solutions or clear ways
606
607
     forward.
608
          We support Chairman Wheeler's state intent to rein-in
609
     JSA's, study shared service agreements, and maintain the
610
     status quo on cross-ownership between print and broadcast.
     Further consolidation will not help. It is not about saving
611
     call letters, NASTAD's or Web sites, if they only duplicate
612
     information from elsewhere. JSA's, SSA's and more cross-
613
     ownership will result in fewer employees, less news coverage,
614
```

615 and less diversity in both areas. It also will not stimulate 616 diversity in ownership. 617 Already, JSA's and SSA's have substantially reduced coverage in towns like Youngstown, Ohio, and Honolulu, 618 Hawaii. In Youngstown, for example, four TV stations are 619 620 operated by Lynn Media, with duplicated material being 621 presented on those stations. Lynn Media is in competition 622 with two other stations that are owned and operated in 623 conjunction with the Youngstown Vindicator newspaper. When Lynn consolidated stations, it eliminated most newsroom jobs 624 in the accreted newsrooms. The Vindicator and its broadcast 625 stations have small staffs in their newsrooms and share 626 627 material. Overall, employment has shrunk and diversity of coverage as well. Cable, by the way, adds almost nothing 628 locally. 629 We are often told that combinations allow for more 630 coverage. That is just not the case, as the efficiencies are 631 632 used purely to increase profitability through less staff. 633 Honolulu is a similar case to Youngstown, and well documented. Three of five stations operate as if they were a 634 635 single news operation, with almost identical news,

636 significantly diminishing local coverage. 637 In Syracuse, New York, and Peoria, Illinois, Granite and Barrington Broadcasting swopped and combined news operations 638 in each city. Our union commissioned a national study by--639 done by the University of Delaware. The study reported that 640 7--70 workers were laid off and 16 were reassigned. 641 642 Barrington Broadcasting now runs 3 stations in Syracuse with 643 the same news staff. The Syracuse and Peoria markets both 644 lost competing and different points of view in news coverage 645 through duplication. We get to a station where some broadcast stations -- we 646 647 get to a situation where some broadcast stations are essentially zombies. Broadcasting continues but there are 648 few, if any, employees involved. The JSA's allow for 649 650 consolidation on the advertising side. 651 We believe the goal of restricting JSA's where more than 652 15 percent of sales are attributed to another station is a 653 good one. We also agree with the FCC about studying SSA's to 654 see if similar restrictions would be in order. There needs to be a procedure and a test to revive such stations, 655

allowing for more hiring, diversity of coverage, and the

656

657 potential, the potential for diversity of ownership. The FCC is on the right track, if that really is the goal. 658 659 Again, further concentration will make this worse. The status quo continues the current dilemma. Only new 660 guidelines will provide for a better competition, and a 661 662 robust landscape that may allow for diversity of ownership, 663 which is at scandalous levels, as has already been discussed 664 here. 665 Let me also strike at the heart of the myth of diverse content, because the Internet is adding so many voices. This 666 is a very important point. Much of what the Internet has 667 added is opinion, not well-sourced and not particularly 668 helpful. A Pew Study of Baltimore Tribune Paper in 2012 669 demonstrated that although there were 53 news outlets for 670 local content, 83 percent of stories were repetitive, with no 671 672 new information. Legacy print content providers accounted 673 for 48 percent of content, with local broadcast providing 674 about 1/3. Almost no breaking information came from the non-675 legacy platforms. Since the study, the Sun--the Baltimore Sun, the principle Provider of news, has shrunk 676 677 substantially.

```
678
          As a labor union that cares deeply about democracy, we
    believe further concentration will mean less credible news
679
680
     and information to citizens as major debates take place over
681
     the future of America. Citizens should expect their rights
     to be paramount over broadcasters, as has been established in
682
     law. We need real innovation and investment as we continue
683
684
     forward in the 21st century. Consolidating existing
685
     organizations with fewer employees does not get us there.
686
          I would also note that the breaking news last night on
     the Virginia election, I got that through a print source that
687
     actually came in through a Tweet. The original news actually
688
     came from a print organization.
689
690
          I look forward to any questions. Thank you.
691
          [The prepared statement of Mr. Lunzer follows:]
     ********** INSERT 3 *********
692
```

```
693 Mr. {Walden.} Mr. Boyle, you are now recognized for 694 your 5 minutes.
```

695 ^STATEMENT OF PAUL BOYLE 696 Mr. {Boyle.} Congressman Terry, Ranking Member Eshoo, and members of the subcommittee, on behalf of our 2,000-plus 697 698 member newspapers, thank you for providing this opportunity 699 to testify. 700 The subcommittee's focus on Media Ownership in the 21st 701 Century is appropriate. Many of our ownership regulations 702 are creatures of the 20th century, and are no longer suitable 703 for today's multimedia world. My testimony will focus on one 704 such outdated regulation; the newspaper/broadcast cross-705 ownership ban. The FCC adopted this ban in 1975. The rule 706 prohibits investors from owning both a daily newspaper and a 707 television or radio station in the same market. At the time, the Commission feared that one owner could control all of the 708 709 news and editorial viewpoints in a community. 710 Many ideas that sounded perfectly reasonable in 1975 now appear behind the times. Those were the days of a single 711 712 nationwide telephone company, gasoline rationing and bellbottoms. Today's media ownership regulations must 713

714 reflect today's media. You recognized this need when, in 715 1996, you required the FCC to conduct a comprehensive review of its media ownership regulations every 4 years, and to 716 717 repeal or modify any regulation that it determines to be no longer in the public interest. Well, NAA is getting ready to 718 719 file comments in the Commission's eighth proceeding in nearly 720 20 years, examining the validity of the 1975 cross-ownership 721 ban. Remarkably, none of these proceedings has resulted in 722 any changes in the rule, creating an endless cycle of 723 regulatory uncertainty for newspapers and broadcasters. We all know that American consumers have access to more 724 725 information and viewpoints today than ever before. According 726 to a recent report on the personal news cycle, the average 727 American recalled getting her news from between 4 and 5 728 different sources in a week, and new digital news players 729 have exploded on the scene. This same report found that 730 nearly 1/2 of those surveyed received their news from Online-731 only reporting sources. Quite simply, there are no longer 732 any barriers to entry in the distribution of news and information. However, in-depth investigative original 733 734 reporting that is professionally edited takes a substantial

735 commitment of resources. Newspapers have always made this 736 commitment. 737 Some have argued that the repeal of the cross-ownership ban will lead to a massive wave of mergers. Nothing could be 738 further from the truth, but in light of rapid changes in 739 740 media consumption, some newspapers likely will come on the 741 market. The ban reduces the number of potential buyers who 742 might want to invest in a newspaper, including an owner of a 743 broadcast station with deep resources and a commitment to 744 journalism. And when local television or radio stations become available for sale, the only media companies that are 745 746 barred from bidding on them are newspaper companies; 747 companies that have had a long history of producing local 748 news in that community. 749 Some of the Nation's top journalism has occurred in 750 communities that have cross-owned newspapers and broadcast 751 stations. For example, two of the primary news sources that 752 broke and dug deep into the story about mismanagement at the 753 Department of Veterans Affairs were newspaper-television 754 combinations in Arizona and Ohio. This was not a surprise. Public service journalism is a part of their DNA. 755

756	According to FCC Commission research, a cross-owned
757	television station produces 50 percent more local news,
758	devotes 40 percent more time to candidate speeches, and airs
759	30 percent more coverage of state and local political
760	candidates. Removing the cross-ownership restriction would
761	serve, not harm communities. It is time to eliminate this
762	barrier that has stifled much-needed investment in local
763	journalism.
764	Thank you and I look forward to your questions.
765	[The prepared statement of Mr. Boyle follows:]
766	********* INSERT 4 ********

```
Mr. {Walden.} Mr. Boyle, thank you for your testimony.

We will now go to Mr. David Bank who is the Managing Director

of RBC Capital Markets.

Mr. Bank, we especially appreciate your testimony today,

and look forward to hearing it. So thanks for being here.
```

```
772
     ^STATEMENT OF DAVID BANK
773
          Mr. {Bank.} Thank you. Okay, good morning.
          Mr. {Walden.} You have to push that little button right
774
775
     there in front. There we go.
776
          Mr. {Bank.} Shows my lack of governmental experience.
777
     Thank you.
778
          Good morning, Chairman Walden, Ranking Member Eshoo, and
779
     members of the subcommittee. My name is David Bank and I am
     a managing director and the equity research analyst
780
781
     responsible for covering the media sector at RBC Capital
782
     Markets.
783
          RBC Capital Markets is the corporate and investment
784
     banking arm of the Royal Bank of Canada; Canada's largest
785
     bank and the twelfth largest bank in the world, based upon
786
     market capitalization.
787
          I primarily advise institutional clients such as pension
788
     funds and mutual fund managers with respect to broader themes
789
     and specific company fundamentals in the media industry. I
     help advise investors with respect to how they should be
790
```

791 positioned in the media space, given current and future 792 industry dynamics. I have covered the media space for 793 approximately the last 15 years, during which a tremendous 794 amount of change has occurred in the broad media landscape, especially with respect to three things: the first, how 795 796 consumers apportion their time consuming different media; the 797 second, the new media outlets that have become available to 798 those consumers; and third, the business models available to 799 those operators, and the competitive forces within the media 800 space. 801 Much has already been made of the fact that the current 802 regulatory framework for media ownership dates back to 1975 803 for newspaper cross-ownership, and basically, to the late 804 20th century for much of the framework for TV and radio 805 broadcast with respect to both cross-ownership and single 806 media ownership concentration across single markets, as well 807 as in the U.S. in totality. 808 The financial markets, the capital markets, are keenly 809 aware that this regulatory framework was created before the 810 dynamically changing nature of the media ecosystem, that has 811 overtaken us at light speed over the past few years, had been

812 developed. The financial and capital markets are even more 813 keenly aware that consumer behavior itself has changed 814 massively as a result of the evolving ecosystem. 815 Specifically, the current regulatory framework was constructed in a media ecosystem that basically didn't 816 817 include the Internet. While it may have contemplated a broad 818 PC-based Internet consumption environment, it certainly 819 didn't contemplate a mobile application-based ecosystem. For 820 an illustration of this point, I would ask you to look at 821 Exhibit 1. As you can see, hopefully, from this exhibit, about 45 percent of consumers' media time is now spent on 822 823 either the Internet, on PC or some sort of mobile 824 application. That is 45 percent. We think this is a 825 reasonable starting point to view the framework through which 826 we might want to evaluate the relevance of current rules to 827 the existing ecosystem. 828 In terms of traditional media, there is probably no 829 surprise that consumers still spend more of their time with 830 television than any other medium, as they have for decades, 831 including the time period in which the current regulatory framework was constructed. However, the consumption within 832

833 the TV paradigm has shifted greatly in a way not necessarily reflected in a regulatory paradigm shift. The primary shift 834 835 has been the consumption of TV moving meaningfully from a 836 world dominated by broadcast content, to an increasingly fragmented one where the American viewer now consumes the 837 838 majority of TV content from dual-stream advertiser and 839 subscription fee-supported cable channels. 840 Exhibit 2 illustrates, even 10 years ago, the majority 841 of adult 18 to 49 primetime audiences was not on the big 4 842 networks, but rather skewed slightly more toward non-843 broadcast. Today, that shift is even more pronounced with 844 broadcast controlling only about 1/3 of the primetime 845 audience. As a result, it is clear to us that broadcast TV 846 regulation should probably consider a framework in which paid 847 TV in total, as an ecosystem, is a competitor. This is the 848 case in small and big markets alike. 849 Further, TV isn't the only medium that has seen an 850 increased fragmentation audience over the past 15 years. The 851 radio ecosystem has clearly undergone an evolution beyond 852 simply a broadcast transmitter since the time when the regulatory framework was constructed. Broadcast radio has 853

854 probably been less impacted by the advent of traditional 855 subscription services, such as Sirius satellite radio, than the television ecosystem, despite the fact that Sirius has 26 856 857 million paying subs today with millions more of trials and inactive radios currently on the road just waiting to be 858 activated. This has eaten into traditional radio's share of 859 860 the audience on some level, but radio has been more directly 861 impacted by the advent of the Internet, with services such as 862 Pandora, Spotify or download and podcast services on iTunes, especially on a non-subscription basis. Simply considering, 863 digital radio services offers a framework for which the world 864 865 has dramatically changed. 866 Digital's audience skews younger, but the trend of total population penetration is irrefutable, as illustrated in 867 868 Exhibit 3. Digital radio listeners are now at mass market 869 proportions, representing just more than 1/2 the population 870 and 2/3 of Internet users. Clearly, the game has changed in 871 radio with respect to consumer behavior. This has also put 872 some pressure on the typical radio business model. The newspaper business model is not a major focus in our 873 coverage universe, but it is quite clear that the industry 874

875 has undergone a great deal of tumult, in no small part due to 876 changes in consumer behavior and alternatives as well. Most 877 specifically, consumers simply have more choices with how to-878 -with respect to how to consume news. 879 In 1975 when the newspaper/TV cross-ownership rules were 880 essentially constructed, consumers had no digital or cable 881 news choices. By 2003, over 10 years ago, consumers were 882 getting 20 percent of their news from online sources. Today, 883 that figure is around 40 percent, as illustrated in Exhibit 884 4. That is an astounding change in consumer behavior, having a material impact on the ecosystem. 885 886 The bottom line regarding these shifts in the ecosystem 887 is that they seem to call into relief what some of the 888 existing regulatory framework might not. Digital media has 889 no created, at least on the macro level, a powerful 890 competitor to the media ecosystem that existed in isolation 891 in the prior century. The markets are keenly aware of it. 892 It plays a significant role in the way they fund growth and 893 choices for -- that consumers have. 894 That said, there have been some movements more recently 895 on the part of the FCC to re-regulate some elements of media

896 ownership, and ownership concentration issues in the TV 897 landscape in particular. The merits of these rule changes 898 specifically aren't what we would focus on in this venue, but 899 rather, we put the focus on the isolated nature of the rule changes, without consideration to adjacent issues. For 900 901 instance, the UHF discount itself is probably something 902 increasingly obsolete in an evolved ecosystem where most 903 people under the age of 40 couldn't tell you the difference 904 between a UHF or a VHF station; there is no separate dial on 905 the cable box, but rather the choice to address such changes on a piecemeal basis adds limited visibility to the financial 906 907 marketplace. The financial markets would probably have found it more constructive to view the UHF discount rule considered 908 in a broader framework related to overall ownership cap 909 910 regulation. The financial markets sometimes struggle with 911 how to interpret broader ramifications. 912 That concludes my prepared remarks. I would like to 913 thank Chairman Walden, Ranking Member Eshoo, and the 914 subcommittee members for giving me the opportunity to speak 915 today. 916 [The prepared statement of Mr. Bank follows:]

917 ************* INSERT 5 **********

918 Mr. {Walden.} Thank you, Mr. Bank. We appreciate your 919 testimony. Thanks for coming down. 920 We will now turn to Jane Mago, who is the Executive Vice President and General Counsel, Legal and Regulatory Affairs, 921 922 The National Association of Broadcasters, for our final 923 testimony from our witnesses today. Ms. Mago, thanks for 924 being back before the subcommittee. We look forward to your 925 comments.

926 ^STATEMENT OF JANE MAGO Ms. {Mago.} Thank you. Thank you, Chairman Walden, 927 Ranking Member Eshoo, members of the subcommittee. I 928 929 appreciate the invitation to speak to you this morning. 930 Let me put my spin on 1975, that year that we have been 931 talking about all morning here. In 1975, I was starting law 932 school, watching a black-and-white television with no remote 933 control, and like everyone else, I had only three broadcast networks to choose from. Cable wasn't available to me, and 934 935 satellite television was only delivered to huge earth 936 stations that were owned by cable companies. That was the 937 world when some of these broadcast ownership regulations were 938 created. 939 Since then, we have cable and satellite and 940 telecommunications companies that are all offering video 941 services. The Internet and the massive proliferation of news 942 outlets that you have heard about this morning have 943 absolutely revolutionized the way we consume media, yet time has seemingly stood still at the FCC. 944

945 The current broadcast ownership rules are simply out of touch with the reality of today's media marketplace. They 946 947 distort competition. Cable, satellite and Internet-based 948 media outlets who operate without these cumbersome regulations continue to proliferate and take both audience 949 950 share and advertising revenues. 951 The local television rule, for example, which generally 952 prohibits the ownership of 2 television stations in the same 953 market, assumes the television broadcasters operate in a 954 bubble, only competing against other television broadcasters. That is almost laughable in today's marketplace. One need 955 956 only look at the growing cable practice of selling local 957 advertising across hundreds of cable programs to understand that there is a direct and real competition between broadcast 958 959 and cable. 960 The FCC has recently decided to effectively prohibit 2 961 broadcast stations from engaging in the joint sale of 962 advertising, but the large cable operators, along with 963 satellite companies and AT&T and Verizon, have been unimpeded as they join forces to create a single source that jointly 964 sells to local television advertising. It is increasingly 965

966 difficult for broadcasters to compete in a marketplace that is so skewed by disparate regulation. The 1975 newspaper 967 968 cross-ownership rule that we have heard about this morning 969 also relies on assumptions of a media landscape from a bygone 970 era. The FCC itself has said that the prohibition against 971 newspaper/broadcast cross-ownership is not necessary to 972 advance its goals of localism and competition, and it has 973 recognized that the rule is overly broad as related to the 974 alleged goal of promoting viewpoint diversity, particularly 975 with regard to radio; yet, this outdated rule is still on the books. 976 977 To maintain the ability to provide quality local 978 service, and compete with newer technologies, broadcasters 979 need a more level playing field with our competitors. 980 That leads to my second point. Broadcast ownership 981 rules must keep pace with market changes. Congress wisely 982 required the FCC to take a fresh look at the ownership rules 983 on a regular basis, in light of competition, and repeal or 984 modify those that no longer serve the public interest, but 985 the FCC has failed to follow your direction. The last review was done in 2007, and rather than complete the most recent 986

987 quadrennial review, as required by statute, the Commission rolled its 2010 review into 2014, and then announced that it 988 989 would not likely complete that review until at least mid-990 2016. 991 NAB is challenging this most recent FCC decision in 992 court, not just because the FCC failed to live up to its 993 statutory obligation, but also because the Commission is 994 imposing new restrictions on join sales agreements amongst 995 television stations, despite the fact that these agreements 996 have produced tangible public interest benefits. NAB has shown that these agreements produce more news, more foreign 997 language television, and other community-focused programming. 998 999 Amazingly, the new rules will force broadcasters to unwind 1000 agreements that the Commission had previously approved. 1001 Finally, consideration of the broadcast ownership rules 1002 must be based on real evidence, not speculation. To address 1003 this, NAB asks Congress to undertake an examination of how 1004 the FCC's administration of the broadcast ownership rules has 1005 stifled investment and opportunity in broadcasting. 1006 time of intense consolidation in other parts of the 1007 communications industry, these ownership rules are

1008 increasingly outdated and have significant harmful 1009 consequences on local media. Regulatory practices that 1010 starve media of capital investment are a proven failure. 1011 They serve no one. Not current broadcasters, not interested 1012 new entrants, and most importantly, not the American people. In sum, NAB is asking for you to ensure timely and fair 1013 1014 revision of the broadcast ownership rules. Maintaining the 1015 status quo, creating new restrictions, or even just kicking 1016 the can down the road is a disservice to the American people. 1017 Thank you and I am happy to answer any questions. 1018 [The prepared statement of Ms. Mago follows:] 1019 ********** INSERT 6 ********

1020 Mr. {Walden.} Ms. Mago, thank you for your testimony. 1021 We appreciate it. And we thank all of you for sharing your 1022 thoughts with us today. 1023 We will go now into the Q and A portion of our hearing. 1024 So, Mr. Lake, in the Sirius-XM merger in 2008, the 1025 Justice Department acknowledged that satellite radio services 1026 do not just compete with each other, but with a broad array 1027 of possible consumer substitutes, including AM and FM radio, 1028 CD's, iPods and other MP3 players. And as you know, many new 1029 cars now have docking stations or Bluetooth capability to 1030 connect all that up with other audio services, including 1031 Internet radio Web casting over Wi-Fi, cell phones and other 1032 handheld wireless devices, and the new digital HD radio 1033 receivers which allow old-fashioned broadcasters to send up 1034 to three digital channels of programming over AM and FM 1035 bands, bundled together with the XM analog channel. 1036 Terrestrial broadcasters now contend with Spotify and Pandora 1037 and other services, so it is a much-changed audio market in 1038 terms of competition for ears. 1039 What is the delay? How do you justify not changing the

```
1040
     radio rules on ownership?
1041
          Mr. {Lake.} We have looked very carefully at that in
1042
     our 2010 review--
1043
          Mr. {Walden.} Yeah.
1044
          Mr. {Lake.} --have compiled a great record, and we are
1045
      looking at those trends in the use of radio and other audio
1046
     sources. They haven't indicated to us yet that we should
1047
     change the local radio rules.
1048
          Mr. {Walden.} Really?
1049
          Mr. {Lake.} Again, we have just called for further
      input. We are very interested in knowing how--
1050
1051
          Mr. {Walden.} Have you changed anything relative--
1052
          Mr. {Lake.} -- the market will change in 2014.
1053
          Mr. {Walden.} --to the radio rules since 1996?
1054
          Mr. {Lake.} No, those rules have not been changed--
1055
           Mr. {Walden.} Right.
1056
          Mr. {Lake.} --since Congress put the current--
1057
           Mr. {Walden.} Do you think the market has changed since
1058
      1996 in terms of audio offerings and competition in the audio
1059
     marketplace?
1060
          Mr. {Lake.} The entire marketplace has changed, both
```

```
audio and--
1061
1062
          Mr. {Walden.} But the rules have not.
1063
          Mr. {Lake.} Our task is to try to determine in this--at
1064
      the current state of evolution what are the appropriate
1065
     rules. And, again, we are very open to all input on that
1066
     subject.
1067
          Mr. {Walden.} Because I sense from your testimony you
1068
     are not. I mean it kind of indicates you are going to go
1069
     with the existing rules. Right?
1070
          Mr. {Lake.} What we have done, I think, is to analyze
1071
     the record as it now stands. We have a very extensive
1072
     record, but we are very open to further input, and--
1073
          Mr. {Walden.} Yeah.
1074
          Mr. {Lake.} --I think if you read--
1075
          Mr. {Walden.} So--
          Mr. {Lake.} --further notice carefully, it says that it
1076
1077
      says, which is that we are open to all further input. Those-
1078
      -all of the issues are open.
1079
          Mr. {Walden.} Okay. I am glad to hear that because, as
1080
     you know, I was a radio broadcaster, we had to do the Olympic
1081
      ring theory to justify having two AM's and three FM's in a
```

market that was, I don't know, several hundred square miles 1082 1083 probably. And ours had competition with XM and Sirius. 1084 was really before Pandora took off. I have got three--five 1085 audio platforms out there, and you all allow, and justice 1086 allowed XM and Sirius to merge, and said here is the 1087 marketplace as we see it. And then for broadcasters, you 1088 say, no, no, you can't have another platform in a market. 1089 We, frankly, rescued some stations that were in pretty bad 1090 shape, and restored local programming, split them apart. I 1091 just think you guys don't get it, that the marketplace has 1092 changed dramatically. And the statute requires you to get 1093 it. And here we have been a quadrennial review, and for a 1094 whole set of reasons, not yours, you don't have a vote at the 1095 Commission so I am picking on you, but not really, okay, but 1096 the message will get through because I imagine the Commissioners listen in occasionally. And I just wonder, 1097 1098 television has changed, newspapers are going broke, 1099 Craigslist has done amazing things to classified advertising. 1100 Mr. Lunzer, you probably don't have a lot of people working 1101 in the classified ad bureau anymore, do you? And a lot of it 1102 was propped up by legal notice requirements through the

1103 housing crash with foreclosures. That made up a lot of 1104 revenue, but that is going away, and I worry about the future 1105 of newspapers. I don't even like what they write about me 1106 sometimes and I still worry about them. Some of the time. 1107 Yeah, well, but the point is it is a vibrant marketplace, and 1108 I think our rules are outdated. And so, again, I worry about 1109 what you are doing with the JSA's, because I sense from your 1110 testimony, Mr. Lake, it is almost like you think that the 1111 sales department controls the news department. 1112 Mr. {Lake.} The conclusion we reached with respect to 1113 both radio and TV JSA's is that if one station controls the principle source of revenue for another, it is likely to have 1114 1115 an influence on the ability to influence the conduct of the 1116 second station. And that is the test under our attribution 1117 rules. 1118 Mr. {Walden.} Okay. I would like to go to Ms. Mago. 1119 You said that because of some consolidation, the market is actually better served. What is your evidence for that? 1120 1121 Ms. {Mago.} We showed a number of different markets 1122 where there was the specific advantages that came from the shared services arrangements. For example, in Wichita, 1123

1124 Kansas, they were--stations were able to do a JSA combination 1125 to provide the first Spanish language news in the entire 1126 State of Kansas. Similarly, in a situation in Eureka, 1127 California, you had two stations that didn't have any local 1128 news at all. By combining their resources to be able to get 1129 the efficiencies that came through those shared operations, 1130 both were able to start news operations in the Eureka market 1131 where there had only been one before that, and that is 1132 something that was a great advantage to the communities. 1133 Mr. {Walden.} All right, my time has expired. Thank 1134 you all for your testimony and the work you do in this area. 1135 Ms. Eshoo for 5 minutes. 1136 Ms. {Eshoo.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you to 1137 each one of our quests today. 1138 Varying views and I have listened hard to what each one 1139 of you said, and I can't help but think that some of my 1140 thinking relative to what--some of the testimony is the opposite of what you said. And so I want to go the other way 1141 1142 and test out some of the things that have been put out about 1143 how great media consolidation is and how well it serves our 1144 country.

1145 I started out today by stating I think one of the most 1146 important principles relative to a democracy. Now, our 1147 democracy is old, India's I think is large and vibrant as 1148 well, but would anyone suggest that because that is an old 1149 idea, it is a bad one, that we should take up something that 1150 would change the whole idea of democracy? I don't think so. 1151 So I--while I celebrate the new platforms, the new services, 1152 so many of them, I will--I would be willing to wager the 1153 majority of them, being established in my congressional 1154 district, that we need to examine this in terms of what 1155 consolidation is actually going to do for the American 1156 people. 1157 I understand business models, capital markets, how they want to invest, what is going to serve them well. That--in 1158 1159 many ways, many of those business approaches were blow apart 1160 in 2008 when we had a near total economic collapse in our country. That was one hell of a business model that was 1161 1162 brought to the American people. So I think that, you know, 1163 it has been said that, you know, nothing has changed since 1164 1975, we are out of touch with ourselves and markets, and what we need to do, I would suggest that some of the business 1165

1166 models are out of touch with what the American people should 1167 be receiving. I don't know who is going to stand next to the 1168 model that Ms. Gonzalez described. I mean that is really, as 1169 the chairman said, powerful testimony. 1170 So if we consolidate more, are minorities in our country 1171 going to progress? No one addressed that. I never heard 1172 anyone address that. So if you have some points to make on 1173 that, I think it would be terrific, but honestly, I just 1174 don't--I think that people care. They care enormously if, in 1175 their market, there is one outfit that owns the newspaper, 1176 runs the TV stations and the radio stations, what kind of 1177 line of information, what is the value and the texture and 1178 the fabric and the content of just that one line being fed to 1179 people? I think that there are some countries in the world 1180 where we shun and make fun of that model because this one 1181 line to people. I want to hear diversity of thinking, and I would suggest that there is a lot of junk out there too, even 1182 1183 though we have many more things at our fingertips, and for, 1184 you know, for the broadcasters, God bless you, you do a lot 1185 of things for -- in terms of localism, we have had testimony on 1186 that, but you also have the airwaves that belong to the

1187 American people, and you don't pay for that. So that is a 1188 pretty darn good deal. So why would I want to consolidate 1189 something even more? For what? What is the reason? I mean 1190 what is the prime reason? Anyone have an answer to that? 1191 What is the prime reason? Is it for a better business model 1192 for someone, or is this in the name of democracy, localism, 1193 diversity, competition? 1194 Ms. {Mago.} If I can--1195 Ms. {Eshoo.} I mean I think that is the central question here. 1196 1197 Ms. {Mago.} If I can, Ranking Member Eshoo. I think I would like to put the right perspective on this of what we 1198 1199 want, and what I--what broadcasters are calling for is a 1200 healthy, vibrant broadcast industry, and I think it can 1201 achieve all of those goals that you were just talking about. Ms. {Eshoo.} Yeah, well, I don't know how though. I--1202 that is--1203 1204 Ms. {Mago.} By being able to compete in the current 1205 ecosystem. You cannot simply look at the broadcast industry 1206 as if it is only in its own little bubble. You have to 1207 recognize all of the changes that we talked about here this

```
1208
     morning, and recognize that for broadcasters to create--be
1209
     able to provide the kind of local information, the kind of
1210
      truly competitive services that we have to have the kind of--
1211
          Ms. {Eshoo.} Well, I--
1212
          Ms. {Mago.} --autonomy to do that.
1213
          Ms. {Eshoo.} --appreciate you jumping in, and I am--I
1214
     think it is very interesting today that there is not a camera
1215
     here. We have print media that is here, but I don't know--
1216
          Mr. {Walden.} The camera is right there.
1217
          Ms. {Eshoo.} --are we Webcast or--
1218
          Mr. {Walden.} Sure. Of course.
1219
          Ms. {Eshoo.} We are?
1220
          Ms. {Walden.} I--
1221
          Ms. {Eshoo.} On CSPAN?
1222
          Mr. {Walden.} Yeah.
1223
           Ms. {Eshoo.} Is CSPAN carrying this?
1224
          Mr. {Walden.} It is up to them to carry it or not.
1225
     don't--
1226
          Ms. {Eshoo.} I see.
          Mr. {Walden.} --dictate it.
1227
1228
          Ms. {Eshoo.} Well, I am--
```

- 1229 Mr. {Walden.} Yeah. 1230 Ms. {Eshoo.} I am proud that the print media is here, 1231 so--1232 Mr. {Walden.} We have print over here. We have print. 1233 Raise your hand if you are with the news people. 1234 Ms. {Eshoo.} I didn't--I will submit my questions to 1235 you, but I really think, Mr. Chairman, that, when you look 1236 across America, we really have to understand what more 1237 consolidation is going to do, and I--and myself, I don't 1238 think it really feeds democracy simply to consolidate,
- 1240 that. I have seen a lot of peoples' lives wrecked and bad
- 1241 information being put out in the region as a result of it. I

because that is someone's business plan. I just don't buy

1242 don't want more than that.

1239

- 1243 So thank you very much, and I will submit my questions
- 1244 to the witnesses for their response. Thank you.
- 1245 Mr. {Walden.} Thank the gentlelady.
- 1246 And now we will go to Mr. Latta, the vice chair of the
- 1247 subcommittee, for questions.
- 1248 Mr. {Latta.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And, again,
- 1249 thanks for our panel for being with us today. Appreciate

1250 your testimony. 1251 Ms. Mago, if I could start with you at this time. What would be the effect of the FCC's proposal to attribute 1252 1253 stations a -- under a JSA and calculating a broadcaster's media 1254 ownership cap? 1255 Ms. {Mago.} For many of the stations that have been 1256 operating under the JSA's that were, in fact, proved by the 1257 Commission, it is going to mean that they are going to have 1258 to unwind those operations within the 2 years, as Mr. Lake 1259 described, and that means that they are going to have to 1260 either go out of business, they are going to have to find 1261 other sources of revenues, because those efficiencies that 1262 they have been operated under have been what have allowed them to provide greater service to their communities. So 1263 1264 there is going to be a reduction of the amount of the service that is available in the communities. 1265 1266 Mr. {Latta.} Okay, and the next part of the question 1267 then, what effect would that have when you are talking--1268 looking at a reduction for services in that community, or 1269 communities? What would you see that as? Ms. {Mago.} I seem that as harmful to the American 1270

1271 public, and that reduction could be that, for example, where 1272 you have the stations -- the station that I referred to before 1273 in Wichita, Kansas, where the Spanish news operation is being 1274 facilitated by the fact that there is a joint sales 1275 arrangement--agreement that is in that market. That might 1276 well have to go away or find some other way of being financed 1277 that would not give it the kind of resources that they need. 1278 Other markets have similar stories that go with it, where the 1279 Tuvalu College in -- that is also operating under a JSA, and 1280 they have presented evidence to the Commission that they would not be able to provide the services that they could to 1281 1282 their community. 1283 Mr. {Latta.} All right, thank you. Mr. Lake, you note in your testimony, under further 1284 1285 notice tentatively affirms that media ownership limits remain necessary in the current marketplace, despite the prevalence 1286 of new electronic media. So--and how is the FCC making that 1287 1288 determination without first having conducted a thorough review of the marketplace to justify those limits? 1289 1290 Mr. {Lake.} We looked at the record as it now exists, and while my friend, Jane, is right that the market has 1291

1292 evolved quite a bit since she began law school, it continues 1293 to evolve. I am sure it will be very different 5 years or 10 1294 years from now. And our task is to try to determine what 1295 rules are appropriate for the current state of evolution. 1296 And one of the things that we find in the current record is 1297 that while distribution of news--local news and information, 1298 in particular, has become much more diverse; people find it 1299 on the Internet and elsewhere, the sources of that news and 1300 information remain principally the traditional media; 1301 newspapers and broadcast television. We also note that while 1302 broadband is changing everything in the country, there remains about 20--30 percent of the population that doesn't 1303 1304 have broadband at home. 1305 In 5 years or 10 years, if that figure is much closer to 1306 100 percent, and if the electronic media are generating more 1307 original news than they do today, that might have tremendous 1308 implications for our media ownership rules. What we are 1309 trying to do is to look at the state of the market today and 1310 decide what rules are appropriate to the market today. And 1311 as I say, we are basing our tentative conclusions on the 2010 quadrennial record. We have invited comments on our further 1312

```
1313
     notice, and will look very carefully at the updated
1314
      information that people submit.
1315
           Mr. {Latta.} Okay. Well, thank you.
1316
          Mr. Bank, if no changes are made in the current
1317
      regulatory system, and the ownership caps remain where they
1318
      are today, what is your prediction for the world of
1319
      traditional media in the next 5 years?
1320
          Mr. {Bank.} Well, what I would say is that the
1321
     perspective of the capital markets on a daily basis, on an
1322
     hourly basis, is the intense increasing competition that is
     being ratcheted up by a competing ecosystem from the Online
1323
1324
     media world.
1325
           I think that over that period of time, over a 5-year
     period of time, we would expect to see continued wallet-in-
1326
1327
     mind share loss by the traditional medial players to Online
     media. I don't think they are going out of business in the
1328
     traditional media world, but I think it is going to be a
1329
1330
      less, you know, risks being a less healthy environment. And
1331
     because of that, you know, the capital markets will have to
1332
      evaluate how they are willing to fund growth in that area.
          Mr. {Latta.} Let me follow up with--your testimony is
1333
```

```
1334
     very helpful in showing us the trends in today's media
1335
     consumption. What does that mean to the investment community
1336
     overall when you look at that?
          Mr. {Bank.} I am sorry, what--
1337
1338
           Mr. {Latta.} When you look at the trends that you are
1339
      talking about, what does it mean to the investment community
1340
     when you are looking at today's--
1341
          Mr. {Bank.} Well, I--
1342
          Mr. {Latta.} --today's world out there, and into the
1343
     next few, you know, 4 to 5 years?
          Mr. {Bank.} I think, again, the focus of, you know, the
1344
1345
      focus of the capital markets is to invest for the greatest
1346
     potential return, and that is often connected with, you know,
1347
      the long-term growth perspective. And I think if you look at
1348
     a lot of those exhibits, what you see is, you know, on some
1349
      level, a decline of share potentially, going to--from
     traditional media to Online, and typically dollars will
1350
1351
      follow that share, whether it is advertising revenue,
1352
     viewership, whatever it is you can measure, I think those are
1353
      the kinds of things that, you know, capital tends to chase.
          Mr. {Latta.} Thank you very much.
1354
```

1355 And, Mr. Chairman, my time has expired and I yield back. 1356 Mr. {Walden.} Thank the gentleman and for his 1357 questions, and you for your answers. 1358 We will now go to Mr. Lujan from New Mexico. Thank you 1359 for--1360 Mr. {Lujan.} Mr. Chairman--1361 Mr. {Walden.} --your questions. 1362 Mr. {Lujan.} Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. 1363 Mr. Boyle, with your recommendation to eliminate the 1364 ban, are there any restrictions that you would replace the 1365 ban with? 1366 Mr. {Boyle.} No, we think that the ban should be fully 1367 eliminated for radio-newspaper combinations, but also TV-1368 newspaper combinations. It makes no sense that a top-rated 1369 television station in a market that has resources and a deep 1370 commitment to journalism can't invest in a local newspaper in 1371 that market if that newspaper becomes available. 1372 Investigative, original reporting that is professionally edited is very expensive to do. And we don't think there is 1373 1374 going to be a massive wave of mergers. There may be some 1375 markets that a newspaper comes on the scene, and we think,

1376 for too long, investors have been on the sidelines. 1377 Mr. {Lujan.} Mr. Boyle, while I have concerns with the 1378 response, with this reason. If there are no restrictions, I 1379 don't see anything that keeps one entity from controlling 1380 everything, and we only get use from one source. And that is 1381 where my concern is, and that is why I was hoping that I 1382 would hear some restrictions, but maybe we could have a 1383 conversation about that later. I only have a few minutes, I 1384 am going to move on. 1385 Ms. Mago, I appreciate very much the remarks bringing attention to an outdated rule, an era of--a bygone era, a 1386 1387 marketplace that has changed dramatically with rules that were put in place in the '70s. Should we get rid of DMA's? 1388 1389 Ms. {Mago.} I am sorry? 1390 Mr. {Lujan.} Should we get rid of DMA's? 1391 Ms. {Mago.} DMA's are actually fairly current. They reflect the market patterns in--1392 1393 Mr. {Lujan.} DMA's were put in place in the '50s and--1394 '40s and '50s. 1395 Ms. {Mago.} The designated market areas are something that has been created through -- for the Nielsen services, and, 1396

```
1397
     in fact, they get--
1398
          Mr. {Lujan.} So--
1399
          Ms. {Mago.} --they are adapted as you go along--
1400
          Mr. {Lujan.} So--
1401
          Ms. {Mago.} --that indicate--
1402
          Mr. {Lujan.} If I may. So we should get rid of an
1403
      antiquated rule that was written in the '70s, but not
1404
      antiquated rules that were written before then?
1405
          Ms. {Mago.} No, sir. I am not--I am contesting the
1406
     notion that it is simply the -- that the DMA's have not
1407
     changed. In fact, they do change, and they are reflective of
1408
     the market patterns and the commerce that is within any given
1409
     area.
1410
          Mr. {Lujan.} So DMA's create a bubble.
1411
          Ms. {Mago.} I am sorry?
           Mr. {Lujan.} DMA's create a bubble for broadcasters to
1412
1413
     upgrade them, correct?
1414
           Ms. {Mago.} No, they reflect the markets where the
     broadcasters are, in fact, operating. They are the commerce
1415
1416
     area around where the broadcasters and the others in that
1417
     market are. They reflect the businesses that advertise on
```

1418 whatever broadcasting service is there, and they are--they, 1419 in fact, are updated. 1420 Mr. {Lujan.} Very good. That is another conversation I 1421 hope that we can have--1422 Ms. {Mago.} I would be happy to talk with you more 1423 about that. 1424 Mr. {Lujan.} --in the future as well. Yeah, I--1425 although we have learned about that where there are local 1426 communities all around the United States and orphan counties 1427 that don't get local broadcast news. 1428 Ms. {Mago.} It--1429 Mr. {Lujan.} So, clearly, something is broken when 1430 local, rural Americans are left out in the dark and don't 1431 know what is happening in their backyard, and when local 1432 newspapers are providing coverage up there because it is too 1433 far to commute to take a local newspaper. I come from a 1434 state where my legislative district takes 8 1/2 hours to 1435 drive across. Out here, I drive through six or seven states. 1436 Ms. {Mago.} Um-hum. 1437 Mr. {Lujan.} But people seem to forget about rural America, and that is where my concern is in that particular 1438

```
1439
     area, but we will talk--
1440
          Ms. {Mago.} I would be happy to talk with you more
1441
      about that, and really address your concerns.
1442
          Mr. {Lujan.} I appreciate that.
          Ms. Gonzalez, you noted in your testimony that since
1443
1444
      2006, there has been nearly an 80 percent decrease in full-
1445
     powered TV station ownership by African-Americans. Some have
1446
     used that number to argue that existing media cross-ownership
1447
     rules have done little to preserve diversity in broadcast
1448
     ownership. I find it interesting, however, that over roughly
1449
     the same period, the use of GSA's by broadcasters has grown
1450
      substantially. For example, data indicates that while GSA's
1451
     were only found in 4 percent of the ownership transfer
1452
      applications pending before the FCC between 2001 and 2004, by
1453
      earlier this year had ballooned to 25 percent.
           Based on these figures, do you think there is a
1454
1455
     correlation between the tremendous uptake in the use of GSA's
1456
      that, in many instances, help broadcasters go around the
1457
     media cross-ownership restrictions, and the decline in
1458
     minority ownership of broadcast TV stations?
1459
          Ms. {Gonzalez.} Yes. There seems to be a correlation.
```

I will note, in Ms. Mago's testimony, she mentioned one

1460

1461 example in Kansas where there is a JSA that is providing 1462 Spanish language news that didn't otherwise exist in that 1463 DMA. I think that example is a prime candidate for the 1464 waiver process that the FCC articulated in its JSA order 1465 several months ago, and--but for the most part, these JSA's 1466 seem, and the consolidation generally, seem to have been 1467 diminishing owners of color, making it more difficult for us 1468 to enter the market, and all around just not a good situation 1469 for diversity. In fact, there are also examples of JSA's 1470 where there are--there is an owner of color involved, but 1471 that person doesn't have control of the programming, and a 1472 path towards sole ownership of the station. 1473 We want genuine involvement and ownership by people of 1474 color. That doesn't seem to be happening in this current 1475 marketplace. 1476 Mr. {Lujan.} I appreciate that. 1477 Now, Mr. Chairman, I know that I have not heard any of 1478 my colleagues say anything to the contrary that we don't want 1479 to see more ownership with minorities as well. And I think this an important question that I hope that we can flush out 1480

1481 and just get more information on as we have the conversation 1482 pertaining to JSA's as well, and I really appreciate the 1483 panel that you have put together and the responses today. I 1484 still have many questions as well that I will submit into the 1485 record, but again, thank you for bringing this panel 1486 together, Mr. Chairman, and, Ranking Member Eshoo. Thank 1487 you. 1488 Mr. {Walden.} Yeah, thank you, and thanks for your 1489 participation. 1490 We will now go to Mr. Kinzinger from Illinois. 1491 Mr. {Kinzinger.} Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman, and 1492 thank you all for being here on these very important issues. 1493 I am going to start with you, Mr. Lake. I have just a 1494 couple of kind of quick questions. 1495 The last time that the media ownership rules were substantively updated was 1999. That was quite literally the 1496 1497 last century, and in the ensuring--ensuing 15 years, the 1498 media landscape and specifically the options people have to 1499 obtain and consume information have expanded exponentially. 1500 It is largely thanks to the Internet and the availability of 1501 online mediums.

1502 It has become apparent that the FCC is either unable or 1503 unwilling to complete the congressionally-mandated media 1504 ownership review. Is Congress going to have to rewrite and 1505 deregulate the current media ownership rules to finally match 1506 the intent of the 1996 Telecommunications Act, and to finally 1507 provide regulations that match the realities of the current 1508 media landscape? 1509 Mr. {Lake.} I can say the Commission takes very 1510 seriously its responsibility to review the ownership rules, 1511 and the current chairman has committed to take a very serious 1512 look and to have recommendations for the commissioners by 1513 mid-2016. 1514 Mr. {Kinzinger.} Good. And I hope you can take back 1515 the concerns of the committee on that, very loudly. And, Mr. 1516 Lake, the Commission adopted an expedited process to review 1517 requests for waivers of the recently-adopted JSA rules. As 1518 you noted, the Bureau is tasked with acting on any waiver request within 90 days of the close of the record, provided 1519 1520 there are no circumstances requiring additional time for 1521 review. 1522 Could you describe what those circumstances are, and how

1523 will applicants know that such circumstances exist? 1524 Mr. {Lake.} We haven't confronted circumstances such as 1525 that, and I don't know what they might be. There might be 1526 need for further information that hasn't been available, but 1527 we don't anticipate that that circumstance will happen very 1528 often. We are very much aware of the commitment we have to 1529 act, if at all possible, within 90 days after the record 1530 closes and that is what we will try to do. 1531 Mr. {Kinzinger.} And so if there is a circumstance, 1532 will you guys be communicating this well to the applicants? 1533 Mr. {Lake.} Absolutely. If we identify such a circumstance, we will make clear what that is. 1534 1535 Mr. {Kinzinger.} And will they know immediately? Mr. {Lake.} We might not know, except during that 90-1536 1537 day period, but again, I think this is very hypothetical because we don't anticipate that that will occur very 1538 1539 frequently. 1540 Mr. {Kinzinger.} And how will this new speed of 1541 disposal metric be incorporated into the management of the 1542 Bureau? What happens if it is not met, and will you commit to seeing this deadline met? 1543

1544 Mr. {Lake.} Excuse me, will we commit to? 1545 Mr. {Kinzinger.} To seeing this deadline--to seeing any 1546 deadlines met? 1547 Mr. {Lake.} Yes, we are committed to meeting that deadline if at all possible. And, again, I don't anticipate 1548 1549 there will be many circumstances in which it is not. Mr. {Kinzinger.} Okay. Ms. Mago, the FCC has an open 1550 1551 proceeding to do away with the UHF discount in terms of how 1552 UHF stations are countered against the national broadcast 1553 ownership cap. This discount was put into law at a time when 1554 UHF signals were seen as inferior to VHF signals, which, 1555 after the digital television transition, is no longer the 1556 case. 1557 Does NAB have a position on that proceeding? 1558 Ms. {Mago.} Yes. NAB's position is that you really shouldn't be looking at just the UHF discount aspect of this 1559 without looking at the larger rule regarding the national 1560 1561 ownership cap. It makes no sense in a world where you have 1562 grown up with the various discounts, with the ownership 1563 sizes, to look at that without considering the larger rule. 1564 It is not a standalone rule.

1565 Mr. {Kinzinger.} Okay. 1566 Mr. Chairman, I still have a minute and 30, but I will 1567 yield back. 1568 Mr. {Walden.} Gentleman yields back. 1569 Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. 1570 Rush. Turn on your mike please. Mr. {Rush.} Mr. Chairman--1571 1572 Mr. {Walden.} We are glad to have you back, Mr. Rush. 1573 Mr. {Rush.} Well, and I am very glad to be back, Mr. 1574 Chairman, and thank you for all your concern, both for me and 1575 my wife. I really appreciate it. 1576 I want to welcome all the witnesses, and I want to let 1577 you know I appreciate your testimony, and I appreciate you 1578 spending this time with us to discuss the FCC media ownership 1579 rule. And this is an issue, an area of concern that I have 1580 had over the last 21 years and I have been in Congress, and 1581 certainly in terms of my years on the -- on this committee and 1582 on this subcommittee, it has been one of my primary concerns. 1583 And I am really--I have taken the position over these past 1584 couple of decades that one of the reasons why I sit on this committee is to increase the number of minority ownership of 1585

media across the country. And I must say, I am dismally 1586 1587 disappointed. I have disappointed over a number of years 1588 because I don't see the vigorous and the -- I don't see the 1589 vigorous commitment from the FCC. I am disappointed in the 1590 excuse-making and the continual excuse-making, and it is 1591 worse now than it has ever been in the last 20 years that I 1592 have been in this Congress--21 years that I have been in 1593 Congress. This is the worst time for media ownership by 1594 minorities. And as a matter of fact, in the last--if I am 1595 not mistaken, in the last 3 or 4 years, the percentage of media ownership by minorities has dropped almost 60 percent 1596 1597 in the last 4 or 5 years. That is not a good report. That 1598 is a horrible report. And as we sit, there are only four 1599 African-Americans who own television stations in the Nation, 1600 in this great nation of ours. And we have an agency that is 1601 responsible for ensuring that the airwaves, that the American 1602 people, that there is some equality and equal access not only 1603 to content and viewership, but also to--from a point of view 1604 of ownership. 1605 And so my question to you, Mr. Lake, is does the FCC know how many minorities and women are employed by 1606

```
1607
     minorities, and women broadcasters, compared to how many are
1608
     hired by non-minority and non-women broadcasters? Do you all
1609
      keep that kind of information?
1610
          Mr. {Lake.} We do not have that employment breakdown.
1611
     We have EEO rules that require all stations, regardless of
1612
      their ownership, to do outreach in their employment.
1613
          Mr. {Rush.} Well, how do you justify in the FCC, how do
1614
      you justify a decrease of 60 percent of minority owners?
1615
          Mr. {Lake.} The Commission does have a longstanding
1616
      goal, as you know, to--of promoting minority and women
1617
     ownership of broadcast stations--
1618
          Mr. {Rush.} No, I don't--
1619
          Mr. {Lake.} We feel your dissatisfaction.
          Mr. {Rush.} I don't know it because I hear about it,
1620
     but I have never witnessed it. I have never seen that
1621
1622
     posture and that attitude. I have never seen that program
     and that commitment by any--by, I would say, most of the
1623
1624
     commissioners over there. I see--I heard of good intentions,
      I hear a lot of platitudes, I hear a lot of tear-jerking, but
1625
1626
      it is all saying, and it all saying. I don't see the work
     being done. I don't see them rolling up their sleeves and
1627
```

1628 solving this problem that should be solved. It should have 1629 been solved a long time ago, but I still just hear a lot of--1630 we know it is a--from the FCC, I hear a lot of yes, you are 1631 right, yes, we are--it is longstanding, but how long is 1632 longstanding? 1633 Mr. {Lake.} We share your dissatisfaction with the 1634 results so far, but we are taking concrete action. One of 1635 the results of our recent action on JSA's, we think, will be 1636 to open more opportunities for truly independent owners of TV 1637 stations, including minority and women owners. As you probably know, there was a list of about 30 civil rights and 1638 1639 other public interest groups that supported our taking that 1640 action, and we hope that they are right and that we are 1641 right; that it will open opportunities for minority owners. 1642 We also recently relaxed our approach to foreign 1643 investment in broadcast stations. Again, civil rights groups 1644 urged us to do that as a way of trying to solve some of the 1645 access to capital problems that minority owners face. So we are taking concrete action. We are constantly looking for 1646 1647 additional things we can do. We are always subject to the very strict Supreme Court rules that have been put down as to 1648

```
1649
      taking any action that is actually race or gender-based, but
1650
      again, one of the things that we did in our further notice
1651
      that was recently announced was to review that constitutional
1652
      law very carefully, and the state of the evidence that we
1653
     have, and to call for further evidence that might someday
1654
      allow us to actually be able to justify to the Supreme Court
1655
     taking race or gender-based action.
1656
          Mr. {Rush.} Mr. Chairman, I have one more question, if
1657
     you don't mind.
1658
          Mr. {Walden.} Go ahead, Mr. Rush.
          Mr. {Rush.} If I could. Have you ever heard of the
1659
1660
     critical information need study?
1661
           Mr. {Lake.} Yes, I certainly have.
           Mr. {Rush.} Why was it terminated?
1662
1663
          Mr. {Lake.} The study was intended to gather data
1664
      anonymously to help determine what the information needs of
1665
      communities are and whether they are being met. When the
1666
     current chairman took a fresh look at that study, he decided
1667
     that some of the questions appeared inappropriate and he
     terminated the study.
1668
1669
          Mr. {Rush.} Okay. Again, here we go again, all right.
```

- 1670 So the study wasn't done according to maybe the standards of 1671 the new chairman, but instead of revising it, you end it. 1672 All right? Instead of adapting or coming up with some new 1673 questions that might have fit the standards of the chairman, 1674 you ended it. And it was a study that should take place, and 1675 FCC was headed in the right direction, but again, you have 1676 ended that study which would have given us information, all 1677 right, that would be able to--Mr. Chairman, I thank you for 1678 your indulgence. I am so upset and angry about this, I think 1679 I should end this right now, my line of questioning. Thank 1680 you so very much, and I thank the witnesses, but seeing was I 1681 want to go on the record that I am absolutely, totally 1682 disappointed in the FCC and their position on minority 1683 ownership of marketplace--1684 Mr. {Lake.} And I would be happy to respond on that if 1685 you want to take the time. Mr. {Walden.} We need to actually move on, but I--Mr. 1686 1687 Rush, thank you. I know you are passionate about this, and 1688 we all know that, and I appreciate your participation in the 1689 hearing.
- 1690 We will turn now to, I believe, the gentleman from

1691 Illinois, Mr. Shimkus, for 5 minutes. 1692 Mr. {Shimkus.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I do have 1693 great respect for my friend from the Chicago area, and it was 1694 important for him to get his time that he needed to finish 1695 up. 1696 I too am disappointed with the FCC, but not for the 1697 totally same -- and I said in the opening statement, when 1698 federal agencies, regardless of who they are, don't comply 1699 with the law and delay, it makes it difficult for those of us 1700 and conservatives that are in the country to say there is a 1701 legitimate reason to have that agency. If our government and 1702 our agencies would comply with law and be expeditious in the 1703 processing, it would make it easier, and I would just hope 1704 you would take that back to the FCC and the commissioners. 1705 That is the importance of getting these quadrennial reviews. 1706 I mean it has to be embarrassing to come up here and say, 1707 really, we haven't done 2010 and 2014, and we are going to 1708 get around to it. So I am just beating a dead horse, but 1709 the--again, you don't make it easier for us. 1710 Let me go to Mr. Bank please. Unless you addressed this 1711 in a question and answer while I was gone, because I am up at

the Health Subcommittee meeting too, I am not sure you 1712 1713 addressed the impact of the FCC's changes to the attribution 1714 of joint sales agreement in your statement. You may have 1715 gotten it in a question, and if you did, I apologize. Can 1716 you tell us about the investment community's reaction to the 1717 FCC's recent announcement that they will force broadcasters 1718 to unwind joint sales agreements if the broadcaster finds 1719 itself over the local ownership cap? 1720 Mr. {Bank.} Well, the sun setting of the JSA provisions 1721 for some of those stations without a grandfathering provision 1722 has been certainly concerning to the capital markets. You 1723 know, I think the capital markets were initially just kind of confused, but the reality is those are events that took value 1724 1725 away from those companies. It is -- and I think it was 1726 reflected in the reaction of the capital markets. 1727 Mr. {Shimkus.} Yeah, and people know who follow this 1728 committee and follow my service here, you know, I represent 1729 1/3 of the State of Illinois, I only have 6 media markets, 1730 most of them are small or medium-to-small markets. Without 1731 this ability, they are not broadcasting, or they are broadcasting inadequately. So the argument--so I am very 1732

1733 concerned, as other communities are concerned about, as Bobby 1734 is concerned about minorities, as the Hispanic community is 1735 concerned, I am concerned about everyday news to rural 1736 America, and that is the opportunity that we are losing by 1737 what the FCC is proposing. And I think Mr. Bank identified 1738 one of them. 1739 Ms. Mago, it is expensive, and this kind of ties into 1740 the whole debate, it is expensive to run a TV station or a 1741 newspaper in this day and age. I think it would be difficult 1742 to make it work, that is why I am here and not out there 1743 trying. Mr. Walden tried in a different era, pretty much, 1744 but there are successful companies out there--1745 Ms. {Mago.} Um-hum. 1746 Mr. {Shimkus.} --with proven track records, and have 1747 continued to do so, and do it well. Doesn't it make sense to 1748 a lot of good companies with good resources to put their 1749 expertise to work in filling--in failing stations or 1750 newspapers? 1751 Ms. {Mago.} Absolutely. We believe that--I--good 1752 stations can invest in their communities, create greater localism, also create more opportunities. They can invest in 1753

1754 quality journalism, provide better service to the 1755 communities, and that is all good for the American people. 1756 Mr. {Shimkus.} And just the stories that I know from 1757 local, small to medium-sized markets, you have helicopter 1758 access where you didn't have it before, you have real news 1759 broadcasting versus satellite in news, you might have a new 1760 state-of-the-art weather station that may be more predictive 1761 than the old one on the old station. So that point needs to 1762 be made as we do, as members of Congress, bring our differing 1763 voices here to try to collectively raise those concerns. 1764 Rural America cannot be left out in the ability to receive 1765 real-time, accurate information, and these agreements help them maintain that in a very competitive world. So I 1766 1767 appreciate you all being here, and again, I apologize for not spending more time with you, Mr. Chairman. A great hearing. 1768 1769 And I yield back my time. 1770 Mr. {Walden.} Thank you, Mr. Shimkus. We appreciate 1771 your participation, as always. 1772 We will now turn to Mr. Long as our final Member with 1773 questions. Mr. Long.

Mr. {Long.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1774

1775 Ms. Mago, you may not be able to answer this question, 1776 as executive vice president and general counsel, legal and 1777 regulatory affairs, the National Association of Broadcasters, 1778 but I hope you can. Are you familiar with a program that the 1779 NAB has to encourage minority ownership of stations? 1780 Ms. {Mago.} Absolutely. In fact, I am--my other 1781 capacity at the NAB is that I am the general counsel advisor 1782 to the National Association of Broadcast Education 1783 Foundation, which runs the program that you are talking 1784 about. 1785 Mr. {Long.} Okay, good. And this was not a setup because I had not talked to you before, and I didn't know 1786 1787 that you were that familiar with it, but I am familiar with 1788 that and I am given to understand that it is a very intense 1789 program, very successful. I have talked to people that have 1790 gone through and become owners of stations. So for my friend 1791 from Illinois, I hope you realize that the NAB is reaching 1792 out and doing a lot in that direction. My next question is for Mr. Lake. What advantage of a--1793 1794 if you have a successful broadcaster, what advantages have 1795 that successful broadcaster to fold into a JSA with another

1796 company, what would be his advantage? If I have a 1797 successful, rockem-sockem station, on the air, making a lot 1798 of money, what is my advantage to fold that in to--with a JSA 1799 with another station? 1800 Mr. {Lake.} What a number of stations seem to have 1801 concluded is that they would very much like to have a duopoly 1802 in a market in which our rules don't allow a duopoly, and 1803 that going into a JSA, which is often combined with a number 1804 of other entanglements between the stations, is a way, 1805 essentially, to go around our local TV rule and establish a 1806 de facto duopoly where a true duopoly or a legal duopoly 1807 wouldn't be allowed. 1808 Mr. {Long.} So it would be good to give up a large 1809 percentage of my profits and things so I could fold into this 1810 arrangement if I am a successful station? 1811 Mr. {Lake.} Typically, these arrangements are not 1812 between 2 established, successful stations. 1813 Mr. {Long.} Exactly. In my area, we have a station that came on the air as a UHF, and, yeah, I am old enough to 1814 1815 remember that, and it was, for all these years forward, it 1816 was kind of like Ted Mack's Amateur Hour, and there are a few

1817 of you in here old enough to remember Ted Mack, but--and it 1818 was just a -- it was going to fold, it was going to be out of 1819 business. I don't care if you would have brought in a 1820 minority owner, a non-minority owners, whoever it is, at the 1821 end of the day, these stations have to make money, they have 1822 to be successful. And I think that the message I would like 1823 for you to take back to the FCC, other than trying to do a 1824 quadrennial review in less than 10 years or something like 1825 that, would be that they need to be cognizant of these 1826 operations, the stations I am talking about in my market, in my hometown that I am talking about in particular, that news 1827 1828 station that used to look like Ted Mack's Amateur Hour now is 1829 winning national awards. Now--yeah, they folded and they 1830 closed the building they were in, and tried to lease it or tried to sell it. They moved across town into a successful 1831 station, but that--I mean I don't understand, I mean I came 1832 1833 from a 30-year business background, I don't come from 1834 politics. I, you know, I wasn't a politician before I ran 1835 for this, so I--at the end of the day, I did talk radio for 6 1836 years and I know, when you do talk radio, you want to put people in those stores. You have to be motivated to do a 1837

```
1838
      good show, get in there, and sell product and have people,
1839
      you know, support your sponsors. So it is all about
      capitalism, making a profit, and I just think that if you all
1840
1841
     blow up this thing, that station that is getting all these
1842
     news awards now that used to do terrible, is going to be
1843
      gone. Whether you bring in a minority owner, or whatever
1844
     kind of owner you bring in, if it is not a successful
1845
      station, it is not going to work very well.
1846
           So I guess another question for you would be, would you
1847
      rather that these failing broadcasters, such as the one I
1848
     described, go out of business, than to be influenced, as you
1849
      said earlier, by having a JSA with a successful broadcaster?
1850
     Are you really that worried about the influence they may have
1851
      if--would you rather then be out of business?
1852
           Mr. {Lake.} A few things in response to that.
1853
      facts of these--
1854
           Mr. {Long.} Answer that question first, if you will.
1855
           Mr. {Lake.} Yes.
1856
          Mr. {Long.} Yes or no, would you rather then be out of
1857
     business?
1858
           Mr. {Lake.} We have expressly in our rules an
```

1859 opportunity for a station that is failing to obtain a waiver 1860 of our local TV rule, and we have granted failing station 1861 waivers. So if a station is failing, it doesn't have to take 1862 a backdoor of trying to become dependent on another station through a JSA, it can come in and seek a waiver. We also 1863 1864 have indicated that we are wide open to consider waivers of 1865 the JSA attribution rule itself in appropriate circumstances. 1866 There are very different circumstances. There are 1867 circumstances in which these de facto duopolies have been 1868 established between two major network stations. Clearly not a failing station situation. 1869 1870 Mr. {Long.} But if this failing station did a JSA with 1871 a successful station like I have described, and you blow this 1872 up or unwind it, then that station would either have to cease 1873 to exist, or they would have to go find another space across 1874 town and go back to being a failing station. I mean it is 1875 going to be too late to come in for this waiver you are 1876 talking, correct, or not? 1877 Mr. {Lake.} It may not be too late. Again, we have 1878 entertained and granted a number of failing station waivers. 1879 Mr. {Long.} Okay. Thank you all for being here today.

```
1880
           And I have gone over my time, so if I had any time, I
1881
     would sure yield her back.
           Mr. {Walden.} I appreciate that. Thank the gentleman
1882
1883
      for his participation, and all of our witnesses for your
1884
      testimony and answer to your questions. I am sure we may
1885
     have a few more for the record that, if we do, we will send
1886
     to you and look forward to getting your response to it.
1887
     Obviously, this is an issue that spans the spectrum of
1888
     philosophy and the committee in a marketplace that is
1889
     changing pretty dramatically and rapidly, and it is an issue
1890
     we will continue to pursue one way or another. So thank you
     all for your participation.
1891
1892
           We stand adjourned.
1893
           [Whereupon, at 12:16 p.m., the Subcommittee was
1894
     adjourned.]
```